REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 11, 21, 27, 30, 35, 38 and 41 have been amended. Claims 4, 9, 15, 20, 26, 29, 34, 37, 39 and 40 have been canceled.

Applicant believes that this amendment addresses the Examiner's rejection and that any changes do not introduce new matter into the specification, limit the scope of the claims or result in any prosecution history estoppel.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC S. 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-41 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu et al (US 6,700,933). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. In particular, all of the references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "the reconstructed portion of the first body of data includes data that has been clipped" as claimed or similarly claimed.

As noted in the specification on page 8, paragraph [022]:

> Embodiments of the present invention provide a post-clipping method in the coding system for fine granularity scalability (FGS) video coding and is applicable to both encoders and decoders. The fine granularity scalability (FGS) enhancement layer encoding and decoding operations can be mapped to simple motion compensation operations. Consequently, they can be implemented by using existing data and control paths in the base layer encoder and decoder. The base layer encoder and decoder thus need not be changed. The post-clipping method and apparatus for improving enhancement layer video coding results in simplicity in multiple-layer video coding. Additionally, it also allows the FGS video coding to be extended with spatial scalability. The enhancement encoding and decoding processing is independent of any intermediate data in the base layer 30 as a result of a change in the calculation of the enhancement layer quantization residue as described in detail below.

Also, as noted on page 12, paragraph [053]:

> The present invention provides a post-clipping method in the coding system for fine granularity scalability (FGS) video coding and is applicable to decoders as well. The fine granularity scalability (FGS) enhancement layer decoding operation can be mapped to simple motion compensation operations. Consequently, they can be implemented by using existing data and control paths

> in the base layer decoder. The base layer decoder thus needs not be changed. Referring to FIG. 5, in one embodiment, the enhancement layer decoder 100 is independent of any intermediate data in the base layer decoder 86 as a result of a change in the calculation of the enhancement layer residue. In particular, the enhancement residual addition applies to the final base layer output after the base layer clipping operation. Therefore, it is referred to as a post-clipping addition method, or simply a post-clipping method. Similar to the encoder 30 shown in FIG. 4, the decoder for the post-clipping addition method also decouples the base layer decoding process and enhancement layer decoding process. In fact, the enhancement layer decoding process can be mapped into a simple motion compensation case using the base layer picture as reference. The enhancement layer decoder thus does not depend upon intermediate base layer data during the decoding process.

Wu fails to teach or suggest "the reconstructed portion of the first body of data includes data that has been clipped." The Examiner notes that "Wu et al teaches that the reconstructed portion of the first body of data includes data that has been clipped (Column 21, lines 37-41; see also Figure 20). Applicant disagrees that this data qualifies as the "reconstructed portion of the first body of the data." Rather, the portion clipped as shown in Figure 20 of Wu is the output of the enhancement layer. This has nothing to do with embodiments of the present invention which are directed to enhancement residual addition applied to the final base layer output after the base layer clipping operation. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the claims be allowed to issue.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC S.103

The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Wu et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection for the same reasons noted above. In particular, nowhere does Wu teach or suggest "reconstructed portion of the first body of data includes data that has been clipped." Rather, the portion clipped as shown in Figure 20 of Wu is the output of the enhancement layer.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that all of the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance.

The required fee for a three month extension of time is enclosed. No additional fees are required for additional claims. Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (323) 654-8218. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: February 11, 2005

By _____
Farzad E. Amini, Reg. No. 42,261

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on February 11, 2005.

2-11-05

Lillian E. Rodriguez *February 11, 2005*